DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 251 UD 017 964

TITLE	Cultural Voucher Program; Program Abstract.
INSTITUTION	Museums Collaborative, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	21p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; *Art Activities; *Community Organizations; *Cultural Education; *Institutions; Minority Group Children; Museums; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Urban Areas; *Urban Culture; Zoos
IDENTIFIERS	Botanic Gardens; Collaborative Cultural Voucher Program; *New York

ABSTRACT

A description of the Museums Collaborative Voucher Program, a system through which cultural institutions conduct programs with large, heterogeneous, adult populations in New York City is provided in this paper. The program began with two goals: to broaden the audience served by New York City's cultural institutions and to provide the institutions with incentives to develop programs which are responsive to the needs of a wider public. Initially, 65 cultural institutions and nearly 3,000 community organizations were notified of the program. The organizations used vouchers to purchase services of their choice from seven selected museums, zoos, and botanic gardens. They were free to expend their vouchers in a single institution or in any combination of participating institutions and could purchase existing museum services, or request new programs geared to their own needs and interests. Evaluation of the program indicated that more than 600 separate projects were undertaken by 24 participating cultural institutions and community organizations between September of 1975 and August of 1977. Costs of individual projects ranged from $5.00 to $4,500. The figures indicate that, although community organizations did not tend to purchase admission to existing museum programs, they did develop new programs which were strictly educational in nature. The figures also suggest that community organizations learned to shop effectively for services. The success of a cultural institution in working with community groups probably reflects the energy and imagination of its community liaison more than any other single factor, and one museum was dropped from the program at the end of the second year for failing to provide services to participating community groups. The program has demonstrated that new audiences can make effective use of cultural institutions, and that a voucher system is a useful mechanism for arts organizations to reach a broader public. Proposed changes for the program include the implementation of a discounting system in voucher distribution, and the reduction of salary stipends to participating cultural institutions, and the inclusion of performing arts institutions and expansion of program operation into 8 counties. (Author/AM)

MUSEUMS COLLABORATIVE INC

FEB 17 1978

ED150251

CULTURAL VOUCHER PROGRAM

Program Abstract

UDO 17964

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Museums Collaborative Inc

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

OVERVIEW

In the past decade, cultural institutions of various kinds, including museums, zoos and botanical gardens, libraries and performing arts groups, have gained sophistication as agencies of on-going adult education, although serious questions have been addressed to such institutions regarding the accessibility of their resources to non-traditional audiences. At the same time that requests for more learner-centered programming are being addressed to them, these cultural institutions are facing a fiscal crisis unprecedented in their history. Inflation and recession have caused operating budgets to soar, and private subsidy to diminish. Concurrently, competition for both private and public funding has intensified, and the importance of cultural programs--especially when compared with overwhelming social problems--has been questioned.

These current economic realities have forced arts institutions to depend increasingly on public rather than private bases of support. Although federal and state support of cultural activities has multiplied thirty-fold in the past ten years, this increasing public subsidy has been accompanied by democratic demands that the cultural institutions substantially broaden the audience they serve, expand and improve their educational functions, and demonstrate their accountability to the public by providing evidence of impact on a wide cross-section of citizens. To address these mandates, cultural institutions need to bring the range of people they reach into parity with the amount of public subsidy they request, an effort which requires the review of previous policies, and the design of new ways to involve people who, in the past, have not been part of the arts audience. Museums Collaborative's Cultural Voucher Program

provides a collective mechanism through which cultural institutions are reaching new audiences, are developing new and effective educational programs, and are simultaneously documenting their impact on a wide range of citizens.

BACKGROUND

Museums Collaborative, Inc. is a private, not-for-profit organization which was founded in 1970 to assist New York City's museums, zoos botanical gardens and historical societies in jointly addressing issues of importance to their continued growth and development. To this end, the Collaborative has established programs in three areas: The Collaborative's Continuting Professional Education Program provides sustained training to working arts professionals in order to improve operations within institutions; the Museum/School Program encourages cultural agencies to develop curriculum and educational programs with the public schools; and the Cultural Voucher Program provides a system through which cultural institutions conduct programs with the large, heterogeneous, primarily adult populations of the City.

Adults in New York City who are not making use of cultural institutions' resources are as diverse as they are numerous, and are difficult to reach on an individual basis; but the neighborhoods in which these people live all contain community-based organizations knowledgable about the needs and interests of their constituents. In the early 1970's, the Collaborative began experimenting with ways to link the human resources of community organizations with the cultural resources of museums, zoos and botanic gardens. Initially, the Collaborative provided direct grants to museums to develop programs with community groups. Although inventive, many of the resulting programs did not respond to the

expressed needs of the groups, and were not always well received. The Collaborative then explored funding community organizations directly to purchase programs of their choice from museums, and discovered that the fiscal instability of some organizations resulted in the use of funds for non-cultural purposes.

The ways in which these early efforts both succeeded and failed suggested a new approach to planning programs with community organizations and museums. The organizations would retain control over program content, a decision supported by modern learning theory, which suggests that active involvement is a critical component to learning. An accounting system would be designed which would enable the Collaborative to reimburse museums directly for their services, thereby eliminating the need for bookkeeping by community groups. The Collaborative proposed this idea for a cultural voucher system to the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and received a three-year demonstration grant to initiate the Program in New York City in 1974.

The Museums Collaborative Cultural Voucher Program began with two stated goals: To broaden the audience served by the City's cultural institutions, and to provide the institutions with incentives to develop programs which are responsive to the needs of a wider public. Although it reflected several years of experience on the part of Museums Collaborative, the Voucher Program was viewed as highly experimental when it started. Museums were not convinced that community groups would make appropriate use of their resources, and the groups seriously questioned the desire of cultural institutions to serve them.

To neutralize potential conflicts, and assure constituent representation

in policy-making, an Advisory Council was established, composed of museum directors and community leaders.[1] The Advisory Council makes all major policy decisions for the Program, chooses participants and determines funding allocations. Initially, sixty-five cultural institutions and nearly 3,000 community organizations were notified of the Program. The participants selected represented a broad range in size, type of collection or service, geographic location and ethnic composition.

Ability to implement projects, rather than ability to initiate ideas, was the major criterion for deciding the level of funding, and annual grants ranging from $3,000. to $8,000. were awarded to each organization. The organizations used vouchers to purchase services of their choice from the seven selected museums, zoos and botanic gardens. They were free to expend their vouchers in a single institution, or in any combination of participating institutions, and could purchase existing museum services, or request new programs geared to their own needs and interests. The resulting programs could take place in museums, or in local neighborhoods. The institutions accepted vouchers for their services, and redeemed them for cash from Museums Collaborative. The Advisory Council also allocated each cultural institution a salary stipend for a community liaison staff member, who planned and implemented projects with the community organizations.

From the outset, the Voucher Program has been evaluated by research teams from Teachers College, Columbia University. A full final evaluation report

---

1 See attached list of current Advisory Council members.

prepared by Dr. R. Gary Bridge and Julie Blackman is available from Museums Collaborative, but their major findings are summarized in the following paragraphs.

More than 600 separate projects were undertaken by 24 participating cultural institutions and community organizations between September, 1975 and August, 1977. Costs of individual projects ranged from $5. to $4,500., and the services purchased by community groups included:

Admission to existing programs, tours of exhibitions, landmarks, etc.	7.2%
Weekly lessons in the visual arts, poetry, music and dance.	53.3%
Courses in modern art, anthropology, urban ecology, etc.	22.6%
Technical training in exhibition design, catalogue production, photography, etc.	4.2%
Workshops on topics ranging from fundraising to publicity	12.8%

These figures indicate that, although community organizations did not tend to purchase admission to existing museum programs, they did develop new programs which were strictly educational in nature. The result is confirmed by the staffs of museums in the Program, who have reported their satisfaction with the quality of most projects they have undertaken, and has reassured those who questioned the ability of community organizations to choose intelligently among available cultural resources.

The figures also suggest that community organizations learned to shop effectively for services. One group sponsored more than fifty-five programs over a one-year period on less than $8,000., providing a broad impact for a

comparatively small amount of money. Although the community groups ranged in their successful use of the Program, and one group was dropped by the Advisory Council at the end of the first year and another at the end of the second for poor performance, the majority made economical and creative use of the institutions. [2]

Appended to this Program Abstract are two charts illustrating the distribution of voucher funds during the first two years of the Program.[3] These expenditure and earnings summaries reveal interesting information about the participation of the cultural institutions in the Program, as well as that of the community organizations. At the end of the first year, one large institution and one small community-based museum had earned the most voucher funds from community organizations, and one large institution and one small community-based museum earned the least. In the second year, two large institutions were the highest voucher earners, and one small community-based museum was the third highest earner. In the second year, as in the first, one large institution and one small community museum were the lowest voucher earners.

The success of a cultural institution in working with community groups probably reflects the energy and imagination of its community liaison more than any other single factor, and one museum was dropped from the Program at the end of the second year for failing to provide services to participating community groups, but one important conclusion is implied by the earning outcomes. Community groups did not make choices based on the physical resources, geographic

---

2 See attached list for current Program participants.

3 See attached Summaries of Voucher Distribution for 1975-76 and 1976-77.

location or ethnic orientation of participating institutions. Their selections reflected the ability of the institutions to deliver responsive services, and two museums substantially modified their institutional behavior with regard to the community organizations--including hiring new liaison personnel--in order to provide better programs to the community groups.

Insofar as community outreach is concerned, these results underscore a significant benefit of voucher systems. By funding cultural institutions to conduct "public" programs through direct block grants, administrators or panels make judgments based on institutional images or proposals, with no assurance that services actually will be delivered to people. Through a voucher system, such decisions are made by target audiences, based on consumer evaluations of services received. A voucher system therefore incorporates a public accountability factor not present in most grant-giving mechanisms.

The confidential evaluations completed after each project by both museums and community groups have been extremely positive, and the evaluators' report indicates that the Voucher Program has achieved its two basic goals. It has broadened the population of people who are using cultural institutions (the groups which participated in the first two years of the Program together reach an estimated 150,000 people), and the cultural institutions have been motivated to offer new services which they would not have developed without the incentive of a voucher system. Moreover, during the two-year demonstration the community organizations valued their contact with cultural activities enough to allocate some of their own scarce discretionary money to arts programs, in a few instances matching the vouchers provided by Museums Collaborative. Since most of these

groups had had no exposure to museums before joining the Program, their increased interest can be attributed directly to the Cultural Voucher demonstration.

The Cultural Voucher Program has attracted substantial interest from the news media, as well as from other arts organizations in numerous cities and states. Articles on the Program have appeared in The New York Times, The New York Post, The Christian Science Monitor, The Daily News, The Soho Weekly News, The Village Voice, Museum News, and Craft Horizons.[4] The arts councils of Minneapolis, Buffalo, and Rochester, and an arts service agency in Boston have retained Collaborative staff members as consultants in designing similar programs. In addition, strong interest in the Program has been demonstrated by arts groups in Atlanta, Cleveland, Chicago, Indianapolis, New Orleans, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle and Washington, D.C., and by arts councils in Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Illinois and Tennessee.

CURRENT OPERATIONS AND FUTURE PLANS

The Voucher Program has demonstrated that new audiences can make effective use of cultural institutions, and that a voucher system is an useful mechanism for arts organizations to reach a broader public collectively. If, in the next three years, Museums Collaborative can prove that a cultural voucher system will generate new sources of income for the arts and serve a wide range of community groups and cultural institutions economically, the Collaborative will have a strong case to present to the New York State Council on the Arts for

---

[4] See appended press articles.

the distribution of a portion of its per capita funds through a voucher system on a state-wide basis.

Although the Voucher Program has succeeded far beyond early expectations, several critical questions will have to be answered before it can be considered seriously as a potential system for the distribution of substantial portions of the public funds allocated to the arts. In its demonstration phase, the Voucher Program fully subsidized the participation of both community organizations and cultural institutions. Such a policy was appropriate to an experimental program, but the continuation of this procedure in the future would limit significantly the number of potential participants--both community organizations and cultural institutions--and would cause the Program to become unacceptably expensive to administer. Over the next three years, the Collaborative plans to test three major modifications in the Cultural Voucher Program which will reduce the administrative costs and simultaneously expand the number of community groups and arts institutions served. Briefly described, the proposed changes include the implementation of a discounting system in voucher distribution; the reduction of salary stipends to participating cultural institutions; and the inclusion of performing arts institutions and expansion of program operation into eight counties.

The discounting system

A discounting system has been adopted in the allocation of vouchers to community organizations. Rather than receiving cultural vouchers from Museums Collaborative free of charge as they did in the first two years of the Cultural Voucher Program, participating community organizations now buy vouchers at different discount rates, based on each organization's assessment of its ability

to pay. Eventually, the most affluent organizations will be required to provide all their own funds for the purchase of cultural services through the voucher system, other groups will be asked to match voucher funds provided by Museums Collaborative, and the Program will continue to subsidize fully the participation of those with fewer financial resources. Of the thirteen groups continuing in the Program from the demonstration phase, two are paying 50% of the money they use in vouchers; six are paying 25% of the money they use in vouchers; and five are provided vouchers free of charge.

Implicit in the decision to adopt a discounting system is the need to expand the types of participating community organizations. Given the limited funding available during the demonstration phase of the Program, the Advisory Council selected smaller, more "grass roots" groups where funds would have an immediate impact. Larger organizations which were not considered initially, such as unions, block associations, umbrella social service agencies, and community councils will be included in the future. These organizations represent constituents not reached by the Program currently, and they frequently have discretionary funds that could be used for cultural activities; in addition, they are more typical of the kinds of organizations which exist in areas outside of New York City. The Voucher Program expects to increase the number of participating community organizations to thirty by January, 1978.

The discounting system should expand the number of people served by the voucher system, increase the voucher funds available for cultural services, and generate new sources of income for cultural institutions.

Reduction of salary stipends to cultural institutions

The funds provided directly to participating cultural institutions for salary stipends will be reduced once the discounting system is implemented effectively. Requiring community organizations to buy vouchers, and simultaneously increasing the number of participating community groups will substantially increase the funds circulating in vouchers. The larger the voucher pool, the larger the potential income of participating institutions, and in the spring of 1978, the Voucher Program plans to ask the participating cultural institutions to start contributing a portion of their own salary stipends. By adding personnel costs to the expense of projects for community organizations, each institution will be able to regain its share of the salary stipend through voucher dollars.

The benefit of this policy change will be a substantial reduction in the administrative costs of the Program, as well as the development of a more direct and efficient system of repaying institutions for services rendered to community organizations.

Addition of performing arts groups and libraries as cultural institutions

In order to expand the types of services offered to community organizations through the Cultural Voucher Program, and increase the Program's potential usefulness as a state-wide model, performing arts organizations and libraries will be invited to apply for participation. The decision to include more cultural institutions is predicated on the successful implementation of the discounting system, and on the expansion of the number of participating community groups. While the size of the Program increases, the administrative costs are expected to remain at a fixed level. The voucher tracking and accounting, previously completed manually by the administrative staff, has been redesigned to operate through a computer

under the supervision of the evaluation team at Columbia University. This should improve the cost-effectiveness of the Program.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION

The New York State Council on the Arts has indicated strong interest in the Voucher Program's potential. From its perspective, a voucher system, if implemented state wide, might contribute to the resolution of its per capita and decentralization problems. The legislation maintaining the State Council includes a per capita mandate which requires the Council to expend a specific proportion of its annual allocation based on the population in each county of New York State. Since the Council now funds only cultural institutions, distribution problems arise annually in counties where the population is large, but professional arts organizations are few. If the Council funnelled a portion of its allocation through a voucher system, community organizations would be eligible for per capita funding, and vouchers could be expended either in local cultural institutions, or in those situated in other areas of the State.

Substantially increasing the geographic area served by the Voucher Program will require the design of new administrative procedures, and will test the extent to which the Program can expand without jeopardizing the careful staff monitoring which contributed to its success as a demonstration project. The ability of a voucher system to serve rural and suburban populations with few cultural institutions will also be explored. To assist in the examination of these issues, the State Council awarded the Program a $20,000. grant to conduct a feasibility study of an eight county voucher system. Currently underway, the study is focusing on the five counties of New York City, as well as three

contiguous counties (Westchester, Nassau and Suffolk), and will culminate in a report on the practicability of a voucher system serving urban, suburban and rural areas of New York State.

The findings of the feasibility study, together with the results of the planned policy changes in the Voucher Program, will form the basis for a major proposal to the New York State Council on the Arts for the distribution of a portion of their per capita funds through a voucher system in fiscal year 1980.

December, 1977

MUSEUMS COLLABORATIVE INC

ADVISORY COUNCIL

CULTURAL VOUCHER PROGRAM

Courtney Callender	Director, the Jamaica Arts Center
Norman Chung	Associate Director, New York Interface Development Project, Inc.
Chrysie M. Constantakos	Assistant Professor, Department of Social Studies, Brooklyn College
John Garrigan	Advisor on Native American Arts Programs
Patrick McGinnis	Chairman, Board of Directors, Museums Collaborative, Inc.
Constance McQueen	Dean of Students, Borough of Manhattan Community College
Leon Modeste	Director, the Brooklyn Urban League
Richard Oldenburg	Director, the Museum of Modern Art
Federico Perez	Deputy Director, the Puerto Rican Community Development Project, Inc.
Jack Rushing	Vice President, Citibank
I. Philip Sipser	Partner, Sipser, Weinstock, Harper, Dorn, and Liebowitz
Hugh Southern	Director, the Theatre Development Fund
Susan Bertram	Director, Museums Collaborative, Inc.

November 1977

MUSEUMS COLLABORATIVE INC

CULTURAL VOUCHER PROGRAM

PARTICIPATING COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

1977-1978

Afro-American Ethnic Orientation Society
489 Saint Paul's Place
Bronx, NY 10456

American Indian Community House
Ten East 38th Street
New York, NY 10016

Basement Workshop, Inc.
199 Lafayette Street, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10012

Bethany Family Circle Youth
Development Agency
1291 Chisholm Street
Bronx, NY 10459

Casita Maria
928 Simpson Street
Bronx, NY 10459

Crown Heights Community Corporation
281 Albany Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11213

The Elder Craftsmen
851 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Encore-at-St. Malachy's
239 West 49th Street
New York, NY 10019

Group Live-In Experience
Community Youth Program
1882 Grand Concourse
Bronx, NY 10457

Heights and Hill Community Council
51 Clark Street, Parlor A
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Hellenic American Neighborhood
Action Committee
55 West 42nd Street
New York, NY 10036

Henry Street Settlement
265 Henry Street
New York, NY 10002

Heritage House of Staten Island
243 Jersey Street
Staten Island, NY 10301

Jamaica Service Program for
Older Adults
92-47 165th Street
Jamaica, NY 11433

James Weldon Johnson Community
Centers
2205 First Avenue
New York, NY 10029

Jewish Assoication for Services
for the Aged
222 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10003

Langston Hughes Community Library
and Cultural Center
102-09 Northern Boulevard
Corona, NY 11368

Magnolia Tree Earth Center
1512 Fulton Street
Brooklyn, NY 11216

Manhood Foundation
55 West 125th Street
New York, NY 10027

-over-

Martin de Porres Center
4-25 Astoria Boulevard
Long Island City, NY 11102

National Union of Hospital and Health
Care Employees
310 West 43rd Street
New York, NY 10036

New York Metro Area Postal
Workers Union
461 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10001

Northside Center for Child
Development
1301 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10029

Police Athletic League
34½ East 12th Street
New York, NY 10003

Project R.E.T.U.R.N. Foundation
444 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10016

Queensboro Society for the
Prevention of Cruelty to Children
161-20 89th Avenue
Jamaica, NY 11432

Recreation Rooms and Settlement
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, Apt. 1C
Brooklyn, NY 11239

TIP Neighborhood House
2106 Crotona Parkway
Bronx, NY 10460

Westside Cluster of Centers
and Settlements
250 West 65th Street
New York, NY 10023

Youth Service Coalition
215 Ryerson Street
Brooklyn, NY 11205

MUSEUMS COLLABORATIVE INC

CULTURAL VOUCHER PROGRAM

PARTICIPATING CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS

1977-1978

The American Museum of Natural History
Central Park West and 79th Street
New York, New York 10024

The Brooklyn Museum
188 Eastern Parkway
Brooklyn, New York 11238

El Museo del Barrio
1230 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10029

The Jewish Museum
1109 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10028

The Museum of Contemporary Crafts
29 West 53rd Street
New York, New York 10019

The Museum of Modern Art
11 West 53rd Street
New York, New York 10019

New York Zoological Society
185th Street and Southern Boulevard
Bronx, New York 10460

Queens Botanical Garden
43-50 Main Street
Flushing, New York 11355

MUSEUMS COLLABORATIVE INC

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Review of Money Spent by Community Organizations

and Money Earned by Cultural Institutions

Through the Cultural Voucher Program

September, 1975 -- August, 1976

Community Organization	Total Allocation	Number of Projects	Amount of Voucher Dollars Spent
American Indian Community House	$3,000.	13	$3,000.00
Elmcor Youth and Adult Activities	$8,000.	42	$7,860.42
Group Live-In Experience	$6,000.	28	$4,941.35
Heights and Hill Community Council	$6,000.	23	$5,724.10
Hellenic American Neighborhood Action Committee	$8,000.	19	$7,505.31
Jamaica Service Program for Older Adults	$7,000.	56	$7,000.00
Manhood Foundation	$5,000.	15	$4,909.81
Mobilization for Youth	$3,000.	14	$2,355.15
Northside Center for Child Development	$8,000.	41	$7,759.56
TIP Neighborhood House	$6,000.	19	$5,661.09
TOTAL:	$60,000.	270	$56,716.79

Cultural Institution	Number Projects	Number of Groups Worked With	Amount of Voucher Dollars Earned
American Museum of Natural History	44	9	$ 9,497.38
Brooklyn Museum	49	9	$17,191.71
El Museo del Barrio	12	2	$ 1,545.00
Museum of Modern Art	35	7	$ 3,685.43
New Muse Community Museum	58	7	$16,452.78
New York Zoological Society	25	7	$ 3,058.00
Queens Botanical Garden	47	7	$ 5,266.49
TOTAL:	270		$56,716.79

19.IV.77

MUSEUMS COLLABORATIVE INC

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

Review of Money Spent by Community Organizations and Money Earned by Cultural Institutions Through the Cultural Voucher Program

September, 1976 -- August, 1977

Community Organization	Total Allocation	Number of Projects	Amount of Vouchers Spent
American Indian Community House	$3,000.	5	$2,998.08
Bethany Family Circle	$5,128.	9	$4,616.57
Casita Maria	$6,128.	35	$4,281.40
Crown Heights Community Corporation	$3,128.	5	$2,419.65
Elmcor Youth and Adult Activities	$7,128.	17	$5,829.31
Group Live-In Experience	$6,128.	11	$6,127.65
Heights and Hill Community Council	$8,000.	45	$7,663.28
Hellenic American Neighborhood Action Committee	$8,000.	10	$7,901.50
Henry Street Settlement	$6,128.	16	$4,238.56
Jewish Association for Services for the Aged	$5,128.	30	$5,059.84
Jamaica Service Program for Older Adults	$8,000.	33	$7,788.08
Manhood Foundation	$6,128.	6	$5,516.00
Northside Center for Child Development	$8,000.	34	$7,849.50
Project R.E.T.U.R.N. Foundation	$5,128.	5	$5,125.00
TIP Neighborhood House	$7,128.	17	$6,904.34
TOTALS:	$92,280.00	278	$84,318.76

Cultural Institution	Number Projects	Number of Groups Worked With	Amount of Voucher Dollars Earned
American Museum of Natural History	49	12	$20,437.50
Brooklyn Museum	46	14	$29,168.03
Museum of Contemporary Crafts	34	10	$ 6,069.43
El Museo del Barrio	21	6	$8,217.00
Museum of Modern Art	16	8	$7,595.00
New Muse Community Museum	0	0	0
New York Zoological Society	48	12	$4,894.00
Queens Botanical Garden	64	8	$7,937.80
TOTALS:	278	70	$84,318.76